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* 1. **Geography and Politics**

Traditionally geography has been defined broadly as the study of the earth‘s surface. But, as far as humans activity is concerned this is often thought to involve four (overlapping) aspects. These are:

1. **Space**- geographers study the spatial distribution of human activities. They are also interested in the influence of spatial organization on social, political, economic and cultural process.
2. **Place**- the characteristics of places, the relationship between people and their places, and the diverse role of places in human activities.
3. **Landscape**- geography focuses on the development of landscapes, and the meaning and significance of landscapes of people.
4. **Environment**- geographers are interested in the relationship between people and their environments, including their understandings of environments and their use of environmental resources of all kinds.

All of these traditional concerns remain central to human geography. However, all of them have been subject to considerable rethinking and reformulation. In the past it was often assumed that space and society were separate things which may have influenced each other in various ways, but which could in principle be examined and analyzed independently. More recently many geographers have insisted that spatial relations are inseparable from society. All social relations are constituted spatially, and there can be no possibility of a non-spatial social science.

There are two ways of understanding of politics.

1. **Formal politics**- This is a common sense view of politics. It is the operation of constitutional system of government and its publicly defined institutions and procedures. The implication is that politics is a separate sphere of life involving certain types of people (politicians and civil servants) or organizations (state institutions). The rest of people interact with this separate sphere in limited and usually legally defined ways. Formal politics is seen as something that can sometimes affect everyday life, but it is not part of everyday life. Example, issues about election, war, public policy, political parties, foreign affairs…

2. **Informal politics**- it can be summed up the phrase ‗politics is everywhere‘. A good example is the idea of office politics. It is about exercising power, getting people to do things. Household politics I.e. Households (parents) attempt to influence children, women to do more house work than men do, is also considered as informal politics. In fact, if informal politics is to be mentioned, there is no aspect of life, which is not political. So, politics is really everywhere.

In general, politics is about power. It means the way power is exercised. In traditional societies power was exercised visibly, it often took the form of dramatic acts, displays, public spectacles. But in modern societies it is invisible; it operated hidden, behind the scenes. In addition to this politics is also about people and their relationships to other. This illustrates politics is made up of social practices.

* 1. What is political Geography?

Political geography combines aspects of both the political and geographic to study how political power is created, maintained, and exerted over geographic space. Political analysis sheds light on how geographic space is divided and structured to facilitate or the wart political activities and functions. Likewise, geographic analysis can reveal how geography is used to shape political identities and political structures as well as to mediate the political views and behaviors of people in places. Today, political geographers study topics ranging from the development of neighbourhood political organizations, to the sectionalism of national elections, to the political geography of global terrorism. As a result, political geography is implicitly interdisciplinary in its subject matter, theoretical perspectives, and methods of analysis. It is informed not only by the discipline of geography but also by the disciplines of political science, political history, international relations, and political sociology, among others.

* 1. Historical Development of Political Geography

Political geography is along established sub-fields in the wider discipline of geography. Aristotle is often taken to be the first political geographer. This is because Aristotle, writing some 2300 years ago in ancient Greece, produced a study of the state in which be adopted an environmental

Deterministic approach to considering the requirements for boundaries, the capital city, and the ratio between territory size and population. In addition to Aristotle, the Greco-Roman geographer Starbo also examined how the Roman Empire was able to overcome the difficulties caused by its great size to function effectively.

From about 14th century through the 19th century scholars interested in political geography and  
theorized that the state operated cyclically and organically. What this meant was that states  
consolidated and fragmented based on complex relationships among and different factors. These  
factors broadly include population size, composition, agricultural productivity, land area, and the  
role of the city. Friedrich Ratzel‘s ―politichegeographie‖ in 1897. Ratzel, sometimes referred  
to as the father of political geography. Ratzel as a founder of political geography is remembered to day for his organic theory of the state and the concept of ‗living space‘ in which vigorous societies could expand. Ratzel‘s model portrays the state as behaving like a biological organism; thus its growth and change are seen as natural and inevitable. But Ratzel‘s political geography was much  
more than this. In keeping with the geography of his era, Ratzel defined a broadly based  
environmental approach to political geography very different from the narrow ―political studies‖  
currently in use. The establishment of political geography cannot be discussed without mention of Sir Hafor Mackinder‘s ―geographical pivot of history‖ which later developed in to heart land theory. This initiated a geostrategic tradition in political geography and it still provides a framework for strategic thinking in cold war phases of USA and former USSR relations. The first major opportunity for Mackinder to apply his ideas came with the First World War. Mackinder and many other geographers were government advisors at Versailles where the task of redrawing the map of Europe brought geography and geographers in to public view.

Interestingly, the political events of the late 1960‘s in Europe and USA had a profound effect on all social sciences. In human geography it brought the political dimension to the fore. This was  
expressed in three distinctive ways.

1. Economic and social geography included political variables in their analyses and  
   interpretations;
2. As geography become more politicized radical geography was created, firmly  
   establishing Marxist geography; and
3. There was the rival of political geography.
   1. Approaches to the study of Political Geography

There are six approaches that employed by political geography.

1. The Power Analysis Approach

It is commonly used by non-geographers. Some of who like to define geography as one of the several power resources of in relations. One such study, for example divides national power in to five components: geographic, economic, political, sociological and military. The geographic element include location, size and shape of the area, the degree to which land is arable or barren, the effect of climate, and the reservoir of natural resources with which the land is endowed. This is, however, represents a limited geographical approach, for geographers do not isolate geography as determinant of national power. A fully geographic approach would make an inventory of pertinent categories and relates this inventory to politically significant phenomena.

The categories include:

* + The physical environment (landforms, climate, soils, vegetation, water bodies etc).
  + Movement (the directional flow of transportation and communication of goods, men and ideas).
  + Raw materials, semi-finished and finished goods ( employed and potential, in both time and space terms)
  + Population( in its various characteristics, particularly qualitative and ideological)
  + The body politic (its various administrative forms, ideals, and goods in their areal expression, as a country, national and international block frameworks).

While these five categories are all viewed from within spatial framework, geographers also work space as six and direct category. In these sense the location, shape and boundaries of political entities analysed, as well as the impact of space up on the internal character and external relations of such political entities.

2. The Historical Approach

It describes the evolution of a political or social unit through time. Historical political geography

has its focus on the past, both for the sake of understanding the past better and for analysing current

problems. ―People will not look forward to posterity who never looks back ward to their ancestors E. Burke. While much that now exist can only be understood in terms of what existed in the past,

Most studies in historical political geography have their greatest value in explaining the past. To

rely upon them as guides to projecting political roles and activities of states today can prove

fruitless and even misleading.

3. The Morphological Approach

It is the study of form and structure. It calls for a descriptive and interpretive analysis of the external and internal structure of the state area as a geographic object. The external morphological attributes include size, shape, location and boundaries, whereas the internal morphological subdivisions include core areas, the capital, and the cultural regions. It studies political areas according to their form that are their patterns and structural features. Patterns refer to the arrangement formed by the association of political units, whether national states, regional blocks, global alliances, or international administrative divisions, as expressed by location, size and shape. Structure on the other hand refers to the spatial features that political units have in common i.e. population and economic cores, capitals, boundaries, and underdeveloped or otherwise problem units.

4. The Functional Approach

It is concerned with the functioning of an area as a political unit. Every political unit has subordinate areas of organization, each with its own governmental functions. These subordinate areas must have stronger political associations with the state than with one another or with outside

state. For the state to function properly it must have unity, homogeneity, coherence and viability

basic requirements for such unity. Viability of the state is related, not only domestic economic relations, but also economic, strategic and political relations with other states. Thus, the functional approach would study state strengthening or centralizing forces and state strengthening forces as they are related to space. Example, with in USA, one of the function of the state is to keep freedom of passage across interstate lines. Another example of the functional approach can be drawn from a state‘s external economic relations. The function of the state is to create or to maintain economic viability for its citizens. Law on foreign trade, including subsides, tariff, and embargos are tools used by the state to promote this particular function.

5. The Behavioral Approach

Behavior refers to the sequence of interrelated biological and mental operations by which organisms respond to stimuli.

* Individual behavior- one man‘s behavior
* Aggregate behavior- includes such types as mass-group, institutional, and international behaviour.
* Spatial behavior- indicates where the various attributes of space enter in to behavioural- as a salient and independent variable. The perception of and attitude towards foreign countries among political decision-makers may well affect foreign policy.
* Territorial behavior- the propensity to possess, occupy, and defend a particular portion of area refers to the spatial patterns of behavior, in which each occurrences can be located by geographical coordinates and the resulting pattern can be analyzed.

6. The Systematic Approach

It is derived from general system theory. The essence of general system theory is that it focus on systems of interrelated objects (person or thing), which enter the system of framework as an inputs, exit as outputs, and interact within it as elements that feed or flow internally. The emphasis is on the unity or the wholeness of the framework. Systems, in to which new elements enter and from which elements leave, are open systems, in contrast to the closed ones which function through the internal generating of energy. The geopolitical system is advanced as a unit within which the political process interacts with geographical space. Political transactions, structures and societal forces are the component of the process; place, area and landscape are the components of geographical space. Process and space interact through the nation of political action areas, and various ideological attachments, organization and perceptions, practices these action areas. Example Venezuela petroleum overriding societal forces, such as nationalism and statism, affect governmental institutions, such as (CVP) corporation venzuolano de petroleo, that in turn shape and carry out the enacted petroleum legislation.

**Chapter 2: The State**

2.1 State, Nation and Nation State

A State on international level is an independent political unit occupying a defined, permanently populated territory having full sovereign control over its and foreign affairs. Not all recognized territorial entities are States. With the exception of Antarctica no significant territorial area is free from State control. Antarctica, for example, has neither established government nor permanent population; it is therefore, not a State. The state refers to a geographic area delineated by national borders, the population that inhabits this territory, and the political unit and institutions that govern the social and economic relationships among people. This term can describe three levels of government: federal, state/provincial, and local. At each level, the state is an assemblage of institutions, networks, administrative functions, and people organized by bureaucratic organizations. When used alone, the term most often references the nation-state or country. Whereas a nation refers to a group of people with some common identification, a nation-state is a political expression of this commonality. The boundaries of nation and state can be at odds. In addition to functioning as a set of institutions on the ground, the state has a lively conceptual existence in the social sciences, generally referring to theories of the state. There likely exist more theories of the state than kinds of states. Geography and geographers have engaged unevenly with theories of the state ever since the inception of the discipline. The state has largely been the domain of political geographers but has seen a recent surge of interest across sub disciplinary fields.

2.2 Emergence and Evolution of Modern State

The division of the globe into nation-states is a relatively recent phenomenon, and the increasing  
commonality among kinds of contemporary states is also relatively recent. Until the emergence of the modern nation-state in 16th-century Europe, societies were grouped and governed in more varied ways, some of which could be seen as precursors to the state. Although nomadic tribes, clans, and feudal groups respected boundaries and territories, their boundaries shifted in daily practice and these populations tended not to operate under an independent governance structure. However, agrarian society’s traded surplus, amassed wealth, divided by social class, and documented population, albeit in localized fashion. Eventually, feudal systems gave way to absolute monarchs who assembled military power. City-states and empires alike carved territories on the map in a more fluid fashion. They shifted frequently in form and geography. With industrialization, class differentiation became more complex and the need for a powerful central governance structure became more acute. States tended to evolve in relation to natural landscapes where conquest and/or defense were possible as well as through the diffusion of ideas and ways of life and the migration of people. Eventually, out of differing modes of war, historical contingencies, and geographically uneven forms of power, there emerged what is known as the modern nation-state. The modern nation-state developed administrative institutions that surrounded a monarch. Whereas political geographers have tended to privilege Eurocentric understandings of states and their development, ancient states of the Middle East, China, South America, and West Africa made key contributions to the evolution of the state. The modern nation-state differed from earlier forms of political organization by institutionalizing the relationship between territoriality and membership, thereby clearly demarcating an inside and an outside to territorial belonging. The operation of power also changed. The modern nation-state also had more geometrically drawn borders and smaller territories. These often were the product of colonization, whereby colonial powers would carve colonies into administrative territories without respect for local practices such as the boundaries of tribes and clans in Africa. Whereas monarchs were interested primarily in collecting taxes and building military power, the administrative function of the modern state involved the governance of the daily activities of citizens. States came to resemble one another more closely during the 20th century. The latter half of that century was also characterized by the proliferation of nation-states and the emergence of suprastate institutions, such as the United Nations, to govern this community of states. Decolonization, the dissolution of empires, and social movements organized around ethnic separatism all contributed to this process. This proliferation is predicted to continue and presents an interesting contrast to arguments made during the late 20th century that globalization would signal the decline of the nation-state.

For the first 2 million years of his existence, man lived in bands or villages which, as far as we can  
tell, were completely autonomous. Not until perhaps 5000 B.C. did villages begin to aggregate into larger political units. But, once this process of aggregation began, it continued at a progressively faster pace and led, around 4000 B.C., to the formation of the first State in history. (State in this section refers to an autonomous political unit, encompassing many communities within its territory and having a centralized government with the power to collect taxes, draft men for work or war, and decree and enforce laws.) Although it was by all odds the most far-reaching political development in human history, the origin of the State is still very imperfectly understood. Indeed, not one of the current theories of the rise of the state is entirely satisfactory.

There are different arguments about origin of State. For example classical writers like Aristotle, unfamiliar with other forms of political organization, tended to think of the State as ―natura‖ and therefore as not requiring an explanation. However, the age of exploration, by making Europeans aware that many peoples throughout the world lived, not in States, but in independent villages or tribes, made the State seem less natural, and thus more in need of explanation. We can also reject the belief that the State is an expression of the ―genius‖ of a people, or that it arose through a ―historical accident. Such notions make the State appear to be something metaphysical or adventitious, and thus place it beyond scientific understanding. The origin of the State was neither mysterious nor fortuitous. It was not the product of ―genius‖ or the result of chance, but the outcome of a regular and determinate cultural process. Moreover, it was not a unique event but a recurring phenomenon: States arose independently in different places and at different times. Where the appropriate conditions existed, the State emerged. Serious theories of State origins are of two general types: voluntaristic and coercive.

1. **Voluntaristic Theories**

Voluntaristic theories hold that, at some point in their history, certain peoples spontaneously, rationally, and voluntarily gave up their individual sovereignties and united with other communities to form a larger political unit deserving to be called a State. Of such theories the best known is the old **Social Contract theory**, which was associated especially with the name of Rousseau. We now know that no such compact was ever subscribed to by human groups, and the Social Contract theory is today nothing more than a historical curiosity.

The most widely accepted of modern voluntaristic theories is **“automatic” theory**. According to this theory the invention of agriculture automatically brought into being a surplus of food, enabling some individuals to divorce themselves from food production and to become potters, weavers, smiths, masons, and so on, thus creating an extensive division of labor. Out of this occupational specialization there developed a political integration which united a number of previously independent communities into a State. This argument was set forth most frequently by the late British archeologist V. Gordon Childe. The principal difficulty with this theory is that agriculture does not automatically create a food surplus.

Another current voluntaristic theory of State origins is Karl Wittfogel‘s**“hydraulic hypothesis.”** Wittfogel sees the State arising in the following way. In certain arid and semi-arid areas of the world, where village farmers had to struggle to support themselves by means of small-scale irrigation, a time arrived when they saw that it would be to the advantage of all concerned to set aside their individual autonomies and merge their villages into a single large political unit capable of carrying out irrigation on a broad scale. The body of officials they created to devise and administer such extensive irrigation works brought the State into being. This theory has recently run into difficulties. Archeological evidence now makes it appear that in at least three of the areas that Wittfogel cites as exemplifying his ―hydraulic hypothesis‖-Mesopotamia, China, and Mexico-full-fledged States developed well before large-scale irrigation.

1. **Coercive Theories**

A close examination of history indicates that only a coercive theory can account for the rise of the State. Force, and not enlightened self-interest, is the mechanism by which political evolution has led, step by step, from autonomous villages to the State. The view that war lies at the root of the State is by no means new. Twenty-five hundred years ago Heraclitus wrote that ―war is the father of all things.‖ The first careful study of the role of warfare in the rise of the State, however, was made less than a hundred years ago, by Herbert Spencer in his Principles of Sociology. Perhaps better known than Spencer‘s writings on war and the State, there are the conquest theories of continental writers such as Ludwig Gumplowicz, Gustav Ratzenhofer, and Franz Oppenheimer. Oppenheimer, for example, argued that the State emerged when the productive capacity of settled agriculturists was combined with the energy of pastoral nomads through the conquest of the former by the latter. This theory, however, has two serious defects. First, it fails to account for the rise of States in aboriginal America, where pastoral nomadism was unknown. Second, it is now well established that pastoral nomadism did not arise in the Old World until after the earliest States had emerged.

Regardless of deficiencies in particular coercive theories, however, there is little question that, in one way or another, war played a decisive role in the rise of the State. Historical or archeological evidence of war is found in the early stages of State formation in Mesopotamia, Egypt, India, China, Japan, Greece, Rome, Northern Europe, Central Africa, Polynesia, Middle America, Peru, and Colombia, to name only the most prominent examples. Yet, though warfare is surely a prime mover in the origin of the State, it cannot be the only factor. After all, wars have been fought in many parts of the world where the State never emerged. Thus, while warfare may be a necessary condition for the rise of the State, it is not a sufficient one. Or, to put it another way, while we can identify war as the mechanism of State formation, we need also to specify the conditions under which it gave rise to the State.

**3. Environmental Circumscription**

One promising approach is to look for those factors common to areas of the world in which States arose indigenously areas such as the Nile, Tigris-Euphrates, and Indus valleys in the Old World and the Valley of Mexico and the mountain and coastal valleys of Peru in the New. These areas differ from one another in many ways in altitude, temperature, rainfall, soil type, drainage pattern, and many other features. They do, however, have one thing in common: they are all areas of circumscribed agricultural land. Each of them is set off by mountains, seas, or deserts and these environmental features sharply delimit the area that simple farming peoples could occupy and cultivate. In this respect these areas are very different from, say, the Amazon basin or the eastern woodlands of North America, where extensive and unbroken forests provided almost unlimited agricultural land. So that agricultural land had its own significance for the origin of the State.

**4. Political Evolution**

While the aggregation of villages into chiefdoms, and of chiefdoms into kingdoms, was occurring by external acquisition, the structure of these increasingly larger political units was being elaborated by internal evolution. These inner changes were, of course, closely related to outer events. The expansion of successful states brought within their borders conquered peoples and territory which had to be administered. And it was the individuals who had distinguished themselves in war who were generally appointed to political office and assigned the task of carrying out this administration. Besides maintaining law and order and collecting taxes, the functions of this burgeoning class of administrators included mobilizing labor for building irrigation works, roads, fortresses, palaces, and temples. Thus, their functions helped to weld an assorted collection of petty States into a single integrated and centralized political unit.

* 1. **State, Nation, and Nation-state**

**2.3.1 The State**

Before we begin our consideration of political systems, we need to clarify some terminology. Geographers use the words State and Nation somewhat differently than the way they are used in everyday speech; the confusion arises because each word has more than one meaning. A State can be defined as either.

1. any of the political units forming a federal government (e.g., one of the United States)
2. An independent political entity holding sovereignty over a territory (e.g., the United States).

In this latter sense, State is synonymous with country or nation. That is, a nation can also be defined as;

A). an independent political unit holding sovereignty over a territory (e.g., a member of the United Nations). But it can also be used to describe.

(B). a community of people with a common culture and territory (e.g., the Kurdish nation). The second definition is not synonymous with State or country.

We define nation as a group of people who think of themselves as one based on a sense of shared culture and history, and who seek some degree of political-territorial autonomy. This idea encompasses different kinds of culturally defined nations. Nations variously see themselves as sharing a religion, a language, an ethnicity, or a history. How a nation is defined depends on the people who see themselves as part of the nation. All cultural communities are ultimately mixtures of different peoples. The French are often considered to be the classic example of a nation, but the most French-feeling person in France today is the product of a melding together of a wide variety of cultural groups over time, including Celts, Ancient Romans, Franks, Goths, and many more. If the majority of inhabitants of modern France belong to the French nation, it is because they claim the French nation as an identity—not because the French nation exists as a primordial group that has always been distinct. People in a nation tend to look to their past and think, “we have been through much together,” and when they look to their future they often think, “whatever happens we will go through it together.” A nation is identified by its own membership; therefore, we cannot simply define a nation as the people within a territory.

To avoid confusion, we shall define a State on the international level as an independent political unit occupying a defined, permanently populated territory and having full sovereign control over its internal and foreign affairs. We will use country as a synonym for the territorial and political concept of "State." Nor are colonies or protectorates recognized as States. Although they have defined extent, permanent inhabitants, and some degree of separate governmental structure, they lack full control over all of their internal and external affairs. So that in order for a place to be considered as State in the strict sense, it must possess to a reasonable degree certain characteristics:

1. **Land territory**- a State must occupy a definite portion of the earth‘s land surface and should have more or less generally recognized limits, even if some of its boundaries are undefined or disputed.
2. **Permanent resident population-** an area devoid of people altogether, no matter how large, cannot be a State. i.e., not all recognized territorial entities are states. For example, Antarctica, has neither established government nor permanent population, it is, therefore, not a State. An area only traversed by nomads or occupied seasonally by hunters cannot be a State. A state is human institution created by people to serve some of their particular needs.
3. **Organized economy**- every society has some form of economic system i.e. refers to the system of rules that are regarded as binding of a State and other agents in their mutual relationships. A State invariably has responsibility for many economic activities, even if they include little more than the issuance and supervision of money and the regulation of foreign trade.
4. **Circulation system**- in order for a State to function, there must be some organized means of transmitting goods, people, and ideas, from one part of the territory to another. All forms of transportation and communication are included within the term circulation.
5. **Government-** the people living with a territory must have some sort of administrative system to perform functions needed or desired by people. Without political organization, there can be no State.

The two terms, government and State, though closely related, carry different connotations. The State represents the political power and authority of the relevant civil associations whereas, government is the agency created to carry out the day to day business of the State. Government is the short term mechanisms set up in order to administer the long term purposes of the State. Thus, every State is served by continual succession of governments formed a fresh after every general election. Unlike the State the government is not a sovereign body. So that while opposition to the State is a treason opposition to the government is a legitimate democratic activity representing the critical difference between democratic and dictatorial form of government.

Political criteria of a State are:

**Sovereignty**- Essentially, sovereignty includes the recognized independent right and inherent power of a state (or country) to stand alone from all other states and for that state to lawfully and independently make and follow its own laws. It is not possible to become sovereign just through self-declaration, and so sovereignty never is a matter for a single state but rather is part of an interstate arrangement that requires reciprocal recognition. This reciprocated sovereignty is very much a feature of the capitalist world economy, and this emergence of territorially based sovereignty has created the modern interstate system that is at the heart of contemporary political geography. means power over the people of an area unrestrained by laws originating outside the area or independence completely free of direct external control. In other word, internationally recognized control a State has over the people and territory within its boundaries. For example colonies or protectorates are not recognized as States. Although they have defined extent, permanent inhabitants, and some degree of separate governmental structure, they lack full control over all of their internal and external affairs.

**Recognition**- for a political unit to be accepted as State with ―an international personality‖ of its own, it must be recognized as such by a significant portion of the international community- the existing States. The State is a politically organized area. In deed it is impossible to conceive of a state as existing, or existing for long, without a territorial base. In war time there may be a ―government in exile‖ while its country is temporarily occupied by another power. But that is probably the only exception that can be admitted. It is implicit that the state has people, and since decisions are made for, and on behalf of, the people, there must be a decision making authority (government). Furthermore, if the decisions are to lead to action, the government must be in effective control of the area within which it claims to operate a definition of a state may therefore be formulations; an area organized politically in an effective manner by an indigenous people with a government in effective control of the area. Each state must have a person or persons whose functions are to formulate policy and make the decisions are to formulate policy and make the decisions by which that policy is to be implemented. In a democratic country this decision making authority is ultimately responsible to public opinion and owes its position to some form of election process. In states with more authoritative governments, decisions maker achieve his or group positions by other means and is not in the same way responsible to public opinion.

**2.3.2 The Nation**

Nation refers to a group of people who share some or all of common identifies (cultural traits) such as history, language, religion, ethnic or racial group, political institution, a common economic life, and a geographical location.

In short, a nation is a group of people who share a common culture and identify, which clearly distinguish them from others who do not share their culture. Example, the people of France are called French. Their ―Frenchness is demonstrated primarily by their speaking the French language, though it is spoken by a significant part of the people of Belgium and Switzerland. But within the whole body of French speakers, a complex of social ideas and attitudes, French tradition and culture distinguish as the French themselves. This is the cement which binds the people together and makes them cohere in to a nation. The members of a nation recognize a common identity, but they need not to reside within common geographical area, example Jewish nation refers to members of the Jewish culture and faith throughout the world regardless of their place or origin. On the other hand, when a nation does not have a territory to call its own or nations without state, we call it Stateless nation, Example- Kurds.

The concept of a nation is essentially a geographical (territorial) concept because, a nation denotes a group of people with a strong sense of belongingness to their homeland, and also place loyalty to the groups as a whole. Nationalism- Is the feeling of belonging to as well as the belief that a nation has a natural right to determine its own affairs. The desire of cultural, linguistic and religious groups to achieve a political status that would give them a limited measure of self-government, sufficient at least to allow them to protect and defend their cultural individuality, is a fairly recent phenomena. Nationalities come in to existence only when certain objective bonds delimit a social group. A nationality generally has several attributes, of these very few have all of them.

* **Common descent**- belief in a common biological descent may have some cohesive force among tribal societies.
* **Common language**- is the most frequent and obvious sign of social cohesion. Nevertheless some separate nations such as Australia, New Zealand, Great Britain, USA, and Canada speak English.
* **Religion**- it is a powerful political force. Example, in Arab world, the Catholic Church constitutes a significant part of the cement of the polish and Irish nations.
* **Territory**- perhaps the most significant outward factor in the formation of nationalities is a common territory. There is a presumption that those people who through the accident of birth inhabit a single state will acquire the marks of the corresponding nation. Minority and dissident groups tend to be absorbed or assimilated ultimately by their enveloping societies.

**2.3.3 The Nation-State**

The European model of the state—the nation-state— became the aspiration of governing elites around the world. Literally, a **nation-state** is a politically organized area in which nation and state occupy the same space. Since few (if any) states are nation-states, the importance of the nation-state concept lies primarily in the idea behind it. States and the governments that run states desire a unified nation within their borders to create stability and to replace other politically charged identities that may challenge the state and the government’s control of the state.

The nation-state is the dominant political entity of the modern world. However, it is comparatively recent phenomenon. It developed in Europe between the 16th and 19th centuries after the collapse of the Holy Roman Empire and the emergence of the centralized state claiming exclusive and monopolistic authority within a defined territorial area. Nation- state is a state consisting of homogenous group of people governed by their own state. In short it is a state with only one nation within its borders. This does not mean simply a minority ethnic group, but a nationalistic group with in a state, example, Japan, Iceland, Sweden, Uruguay, Egypt, New Zealand, Poland, and Portugal. Being a nation- state likely to show the greatest stability and permanence when it corresponds closely with a nation. It is also an instrument for national unity, in economic, social and cultural life. It also used for more centralized and uniform public administration. But today many of states are multinational states.

A nation- state is a state consisting of homogenous group of people governed by their own state. In short it is a state with only one nation within its borders. This does not mean simply a minority ethnic group, but a nationalistic group with in a state, example, Japan, Iceland, Sweden, Uruguay, Egypt, New Zealand, Poland, and Portugal.

**Multistate Nations, Multinational States, and Stateless Nations**

The sense of belonging to a nation rarely meshes perfectly with state borders. The lack of fit between nation and state creates complications, such as states with more than one nation, nations with more than one state, and nations without a state. Nearly every state in the world is a **multinational state**, a state with more than one nation inside its borders. The people living in the former state of Yugoslavia never achieved a strong sense of Yugoslav nationhood. Millions of people who were citizens of Yugoslavia never had a Yugoslav nationality—they long identified themselves as Slovenes, Croats, Serbs, or members of other nations or ethnic groups within the state or region. Yugoslavia was a state that always had more than one nation, and eventually the state collapsed. When a nation stretches across borders and across states, the nation is called a **multistate nation**. Political geographer George White studied the states of Romania and Hungary and their overlapping nations. **Multinational states** are states which are composed of more than one ethnic or religious group, Example, Ethiopia, USA, Canada, South Africa, Spain, France, and Russia. Alternatively, a single nation may be dispersed across and be predominant in two or more states. This is the case with the part-nation state. Here, a people‘s sense of nationality exceeds the areal limits of a single state. An example is the Arab nation, which dominates 17 states. On the other hand, there is the special case of the **stateless nation,** a people without a state. The Kurds, for example, are a nation of approximately 20 million people divided among six states and dominant in none. Kurdish nationalism has survived over the centuries, and many Kurds nurture a vision of an independent Kurdistan. Other stateless nations are Macedonians, Basques, and Palestinians.

**2.4 State Cohesiveness**

At any moment in time, a State is characterized by forces that promote unity and national stability and by others that disrupt them. These forces may be internal or external. Political geographers refer to the former as **centripetal forces.** These are factors that bind together the people of a state that enable it to function and give it strength. **Centrifugal forces,** on the other hand, destabilize and weaken a state. If centrifugal forces are stronger than those promoting unity, the very existence of the state will be threatened.

**2.4.1 Centrifugal Forces (weakening forces)**

Centrifugal forces are factors (forces) that destabilize and weaken a state. In every state there are forces tending to reduce its cohesion. In extreme cases they may break the state. In others it may serve merely to make administration more difficult and to weaken the political power of the state. Such centrifugal tendencies may result from:

* Simple geographical factors of size, shape and difficulty of communication and transportation with in the state.
* The uninhabited or sparsely inhabited areas were created and still create a feeling of separation in the regions on either side.
* Serious difficulties may arise for a state if any of its regions have closer relations with regions of outside states than those with the state. Example, the major regions of Canada, is more closely related in certain respects with the adjacent areas of the USA than the other regions.
* More actively felt is the division of the state‘s population in to contrasting cultural, religious, and linguistic communities. The friction generated by their conflict threatens the stability or even the existence of the state. Example, Canada, India, Belgium
* Outside interference are commonly less important than the centrifugal forces that result from diversity of character of the population.
* The very attempt to produce unity may intensify diversity

A country whose population is bound not by a shared sense of nationalism but is split by several local primary allegiances suffers from sub-nationalism**.** That is, many people give their primary allegiance to traditional groups or nations that are smaller than the population of the entire state. Sub-nationalism can be a disruptive centrifugal force, particularly if a group believes that its right to self-determination has not been achieved. **Self-determination** is the concept that nationalities have the right to govern themselves in their own state or territory, a right to self-rule. They may try to carve out a new nation-state from portions of existing areas. Any country that contains one or more important national minorities is susceptible to nationalist challenges from within its borders if the minority group has an explicit territorial identification. In its intense form, regionalism -a strong minority group self-awareness and identification with a region-can be expressed politically as a desire for more autonomy (self-government) or even separation from the rest of the country. It is prevalent in many parts of the world today and has created currents of unrest within many countries, even long-established ones.

**2.4.2 Centripetal Forces**

These are forces which tend to strengthening and unifying the state. The fact that country has a name, government and defines territorial limits, all that does not produce a state. To accomplish that, it is necessary to establish centripetal forces that will bind together the regions of the state.

**1. Nationalism: -** One of the most powerful of the centripetal forces is nationalism**,** identification with the state and the acceptance of national goals. Nationalism is based on the concept of alle-giance to a single country; it thus fosters a feeling of collective distinction from all other peoples and lands. It is an emotion that provides a sense of identity and loyalty and of collective distinction from all other peoples and lands. Citizens of Canada and the United States, for example, have their separate sense of distinction, emotional ties to separate societies, loyalty to different national sym-bols, recollection of different histories, and dedication to distinctive national roles and purposes. The border that separates the two countries, though open and unguarded, reflects those differences and marks a discontinuity in the North American cultural fabric. States promote nationalism in a number of ways.

**Iconography** is the study of the symbols that bind a people together. National anthems and other patriotic songs; flags, national sports teams, and officially designated or easily identified flowers and animals; and rituals and holidays are all developed as symbols of a state in order to attract allegiance. They ensure that all citizens, no matter how diverse the population may be, will have at least these symbols in common. They impart a sense of belonging to a political entity called, for example, Japan or Canada. In some countries, certain documents, such as the Magna Charta in England and the Declaration of Independence in the United States, serve the same purpose. Royalty may fill the need. In Sweden, Japan, and Great Britain, the monarchy functions as the symbolic focus of allegiance. Such symbols are significant, for symbols and beliefs are major components of the ideological subsystem of every culture. When a society is very heterogeneous, composed of people with different customs, religions, and languages, belief in the national unit can help weld them together into a common culture.

1. **Unifying Institutions:** The schools, the armed forces, and the church are just three of the institutions that teach people what it is like to be a member of a state. As institutions, they operate primarily on the level of the sociological subsystem of culture, helping to structure the outlooks and behaviors of the society. But by themselves, they are not enough to give cohesion, and thus strength, to a state. In some countries, the religion of the majority of the people may be designated a state church. In such cases the church sometimes becomes a force for cohesion, helping to unify the population. This is true of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, Islam in Iran, and Judaism in Israel. In countries like these, the religion and the church are so identified with the state that belief in one is transferred to allegiance to the other.
2. **Organization and Administration:** A further bonding force is public confidence in the effective organization of the state. Can it provide security from external aggression and internal conflict? Are its resources distributed and allocated in such a way as to be perceived to promote the economic welfare of all its citizens? Are all citizens afforded equal opportunity to participate in governmental affairs? Are there institutions that encourage consultation and the peaceful settlement of disputes? How firmly established are the rule of law and the power of the courts? Is the system of decision making responsive to the people's needs?
3. **Transportation and Communication:** Communication systems- the national media are the major instruments in informing and influencing the people I.e. Promotion of national unity by powerful mass media and education systems. A state's transportation network fosters political integration by promoting interaction between areas and by joining them economically and socially. The role of a transportation network in uniting a country has been recognized since ancient times. The saying that all roads lead to Rome had its origin in the impressive system of roads that linked Rome to the rest of the empire. Centuries later, a similar network was built in France, linking Paris to the various departments of the country. Often the capital city is better connected to other cities than the outlying cities are to one another. In France, for example, it can take less time to travel from one city to another by way of Paris than by direct route.

**2.6 Geographic Characteristics of States**

Every state has certain geographic characteristics by which it can be described and that set it apart from all other states. The size, shape, and relative location of any one state combine to distinguish it from all others. These physical geographic characteristics are of more than academic interest, because they also affect the power and stability of countries.

**2.6.1 Size of the State**

The sovereign states in the world today range in size from the smallest the Vatican City state with an area of 44 ha, to Russia with an area of 16,889,390 square km. Russia‘s surface area accounts for some 11% of the land surface of the world. The other large countries are:

Canada – 9,922,000 square km

China - 9,560,000 square km

USA - 9,528,000 square km

Brazil – 8,250,000 square km

Australia – 7,951,000 square km

States exceeding 2.5 million square km are described a very large, while those fewer than 25,000 square km are referred to as very small. Small states range from 25,000-150,000 square km, medium sized states from 150,000 – 350,000 square km. and large sized states from 350,000 – 2.5 million square km.

Example Very small---- Burundi, Lebanon, the Vatican City

Small --------- Netherlands, Liberia

Medium ------- UK, Poland

Large -------- France, Ethiopia

Very large ----- Russia Canada

Size of a state has both advantages and disadvantages. Some of the disadvantages are: a large country may not necessarily endow with resources commensurate with its size, and many of those it has remain untapped because of difficulty and expense of utilizing them. It may be cheaper for a small state to import its primary requirements than for a large state to develop its own. Defensive size may be nullified by difficulties of administration and circulation. Population may be large or small, evenly or unevenly distributed, ethnically homogenous or variegated regardless of the measurements of territory. This is not to say that size is not important. It is but one has to consider it with qualifications.

A very large and sparsely populated may experience internal division, if the area intervening between the populated regions are both difficult to cross and unproductive. Australia, Canada, and Russia, though large, have relatively small areas capable of supporting productive agriculture. Australia‘s central desert, Siberia, and the Canadian Shield all exemplify the barrier effect of vastness, although in each greater political unity exists than in many smaller states that do not have size problems. Nevertheless, most very large states attempt to diminish the ―empty‖ aspect of their sparsely populated regions by encouraging settlement in those areas by practicing population policies aimed at rapid growth.

The size of a state is related in many ways to its effective national territory or ecumene. Many of the states that evolved in various parts of the world ultimately broke up because their frontiers extend to far outward to be integrated with the central area of the state. Continued growth meant growing strength up to a certain point, after which it meant increasing vulnerability. This was one of the reasons to the collapse of the Azetc Empire, ancient Ghana, and the Roman Empire. It also has been a major factor in the breakup of more recent colonial empires, and such states as India and Pakistan and Sudan.

On the hand, size can present advantages. Generalization regarding size might be made attention is paid to location (relative location, with reference to environmental regions, mineralized belts, and trade routes). For instance, USA lies in the middle latitudes, in world zones of many transitions (in terms of soil and climate etc,) and fronting two oceans. Depending on location, then, size and environmental diversification are indeed related. A state that has a larger area than another has a chance to find a greater percentage of such resources with its borders.

When a land is too large for its population:

* Its defense is a burden
* The fields are inadequately farmed
* There is too large margin of the natural products
* Administration becomes increasingly difficult over long distances and thus less and less efficient

On the other hand, when the country is too small to maintain its population, it is at the mercy of its neighbors.

**2.6.2. The Shape of the State Area**

Like size, a country's shape may affect its prospects of development and control. The geographical shape of a state presents only a degree less acute than those raised by its area. There are 4 categories of the shapes of states:

**1. Elongated (attenuated) state**

It may be defined as state that is at least six times as long as its average width. Thus Chile, Norway, Sweden, Togo, the Gambia, Italy, Panama and Malawi are among the states in this category. Depending to a certain extent on the state‘s location with reference to world‘s cultural area, elongation may involve internal division, example the north -south division of Italy. Furthermore; the physiographic contrast within the elongated state may accentuate other divisions. Chile, for example, possesses at least 3 distinct environmental regions. The central region is Mediterranean in nature, the south is under maritime west coast condition, and the north is desert. The internal diversification of a state resulting from its straddling of several environmental and cultural zones may be advantageous.

**2. Compact state**

Compact state is a state possessing a roughly circular, oval, or rectangular territory in which the distance from the geometric center to any point on the boundary exhibits little variance. It lies at about the same distance from the geometrical center at state. Compact states enclose a maximum of territory with in a minimum of boundary are without peninsulas, islands, or other remote extensions of the national spatial framework. Assuming no major topographical barriers, the most efficient national shape would be a circle with the capital located in the center. In such a country, all places could be reached from the center in a minimal amount of time and with the least expenditure for roads, railway lines, and so on. It would also have the shortest possible borders to defend. A perfect circle is an unlikely possibility, but some countries, Uruguay, Zimbabwe, and Poland are examples do have roughly circular shapes, forming a compact state.

**Advantages**

The boundary is the shortest possible distance in view of the area enclosed. Since there are no peninsulas, islands, or other protruding parts, the establishment of effective communications to all parts of the country should be easier here than under any other shape conditions(unless there are several physiographic barriers). Consequent to the second effective control is theoretically more easily maintained here than in any other country.

1. **Prorupt state**

It is nearly compact, but possess and extension of territory in the form of a peninsula, or ―corridor‖ leading away from the main body of the territory. Such prorupt states and territories often face serious internal difficulties, for the proruption frequently is either the most important of the political entity or a distant problem of administration. Proruption may simply reflect peninsular elongations of land area, as in the case of Myanmar and Thailand. In other cases, the extensions have an economic or strategic significance, having been designed to secure state access to resources or to establish a buffer zone between states that would otherwise adjoin. The proruption of Afghanistan, Democratic Republic of the Congo, and Namibia fall into this category. The Caprivi Strip of Namibia, for example, which extends eastward from the main part of the country, was designed by the Germans to give what was then their colony of Southwest Africa access to the Zambezi River. Whatever their origin, proruption tend to isolate a portion of a state.

**4. Fragmented state**

It includes countries composed entirely of islands (e.g., the Philippines and Indonesia), countries that are partly on islands and partly on the mainland (Italy and Malaysia), and those that are chiefly on the mainland but whose territory is separated by another state (the United States). Fragmentation makes it harder for the state to impose centralized control over its territory, particularly when the parts of the state are far from one another. This is a problem in the Philippines and Indonesia, the latter made up of over 13,000 islands, stretched out along a 5100-kilometer (3200-mi) arc. Fragmentation helped lead to the disintegration of Pakistan. It was created in 1947 as a fragmented state, but East and West Pakistan were 1610 kilometers (1000 mi) from one another. That distance exacerbated economic and cultural differences between the two, and when the eastern part of the country seceded in 1971 and declared itself the independent state of Bangladesh, West Pakistan was unable to impose its control.

A special case of fragmentation occurs when a territorial outlier of one state, an **exclave,** is located within another state. Before German unification, West Berlin was an outlier of West Germany within East Germany (the German Democratic Republic). Europe has many such outlying bits of one country inside another. Kleinwalsertal, for example, is a piece of Austria accessible only from Germany. Baarle-Hertog is a fragment of Belgium inside Holland. Campioned'Italia is an Italian outlier in Switzerland, and Busingen is a German one. Llivia is a Spanish town just inside France (Figure 9.8). Exclaves are not limited to Europe, of course. African examples include Cabinda, an exclave of Angola, and Melilla and Ceuta, two Spanish exclaves in Morocco.

**5. Perforated state**

The counterpart of an exclave helps to define the fifth class of shapes, the **perforated state.** A perforated state completely surrounds a territory that it does not rule. It is impossible to reach the perforating state without crossing the territory or air space of perforated state. Example, San Marino perforates Italy; Lesotho surrounds the republic of South Africa. The enclave, the surrounded territory, may be independent or may be part of another state. Two of Europe's smallest independent states, San Marino and Vatican City, are enclaves that perforate Italy. As an exclave of West Germany, West Berlin perforated the national territory of former East Germany and was an enclave in it. The stability of the perforated state can be weakened if the enclave is occupied by people whose value systems differ from those of the surrounding country (see "The Gnarled Politics of an Enclave"). Its neighbors from when alone it can obtain commodities it lacks, and this produces aggression.

**Problems related to the shape and the physical geography of a state**

1. **Divided State:** The possession of an uninterrupted territory is one of the principal requisites for the smooth functioning of a political entity. Yet a number of states are dived in some way. Example, Canada separates the state of Alaska is from the continental USA. Here most of the traffic between them would go by sea in any case. Egypt and the panama are divided in to two by the canals of the Suez and panama respectively.
2. **Physical barriers** within the state Within any state, the degree of the unity and ease of administration are influenced by the terrain and the resulting difficulty ease of traveled. Example, Ecuador appears as a compact state of medium 47 size. In reality, it is divided in to three almost equal physical regions, the plain along the pacific coast, the ranges and the high plateaus of the Andes, the plains that slope down in the east toward the Amazon.
3. **The state as a national unit:** Political theorists of the 18th century argued that there was a right and proper limit to the size of state. Therefore, a framework for the establishment and territorial extent of state should be implicit in the relief and drainage patterns and in the other aspects of the physical landscape. River basins in several cases were regarded as such natural units. Anyway, the tendency for at least century has been to make the state accord with the nation, not with some arbitrarily chosen frame work in physical Geography.

**2.5.3. Size of States**

A landlocked country is a country entirely enclosed by land, or whose only coastlines lie on closed seas. In simplest term a land locked country is one that is devoid of coastline. There are 45 landlocked countries that do not have direct access to ocean or sea.

* Africa - 13 example Ethiopia, Uganda, Botswana, Zambia….
* Asia - 15 example Afghanistan, Uzbekistan, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan
* Europe - 15 examples Macedonia, Rep., Moldova
* South America – 2 Bolivia and Paraguay

The significance of size and shape as factors in national well-being can be modified by a state's location, both absolute and relative. Although both Canada and Russia are extremely large, their absolute location in the upper-middle latitudes reduces their size advantages when agricultural potential is considered. To take another example, Iceland has a reasonably compact shape, but its location in the North Atlantic Ocean, just south of the Arctic Circle, means that most of the country is barren. Settlement is confined to the rims of the island. As important as absolute location is a state's relative location, its position compared to that of other countries. Landlocked states, those lacking ocean frontage and surrounded by other states, are at a geographic disadvantage. They lack both easy access to maritime (seaborne) trade and to the resources found in coastal waters and submerged lands. In a few instances, a favorable relative location constitutes the primary resource of a state. Singapore, a state of only 580 square kilometers (224 sq mi) and 3.5 million people, is located at a crossroads of world shipping and commerce. Based on its port and commercial activities, and buttressed by its more recent industrial development, Singapore has become a notable Southeast Asian economic success. In general, history has shown that countries benefit from a location on major trade routes, not only from the economic advantages such a location carries, but also because they are exposed to the diffusion of new ideas and technologies.

**Types of Landlocked Countries**

There are three types of land locked countries. These are

**1. Land locked by a single country**. – These are countries which are surrounded by one country in all sides. Such a country is also called an enclave. In this case, there are only 3 countries: Lesotho, San Marino and Vatican City.

**2. Double land locked countries.** -These are land locked countries which are surrounded by other landlocked country. In this case, a person in such country has to cross at least two borders to reach a coastline. There are two such countries in the world. Liechtenstein in central Europe surrounds by Switzerland and Austria, Uzbekistan in central Asia surrounded by Afghanistan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Turkmenistan

**3. Single landlocked countries**. - These are landlocked country which borders by no other landlocked country. Example Mongolia, Swaziland, San Marino, Lesotho.

**Problems of Landlocked Countries**

A land-locked State faces many problems deriving from the fact that an international boundary lie between it and the sea. Some of these are:

1. it cuts the country off from sea resources such as fishing
2. It also cuts the country off from access to sea borne trade, which, even today, makes up a large percentage of international trade.
3. Landlocked countries have significantly higher costs of international cargo transportation compared to coastal countries.
4. Losing access to the sea is generally a great blow to a nation, politically, military, and particularly with respect to international trade and therefore economic security.
5. Create serious constraints on the overall socio economic development
6. Forces to rely up on neighboring countries for access to seaports
7. Lack beach tourism because most people want a beach
8. All the land-locked States may be considered militarily weak.

Few of them are truly modem, united nation-states in complete control of their national territory and guided by their State idea. In terms of international indicators of national power they are uniformly weak.

**Chapter Three 3: Frontiers and Boundaries**

Before boundaries were delimited, nations or empires were likely to be separated by frontier zones, ill-defined and fluctuating areas marking the effective end of a state's authority. Such zones were often uninhabited or only sparsely populated and were liable to change with shifting settlement patterns. Many present-day international boundaries lie in former frontier zones, and in that sense the boundary line has replaced the broader frontier as a marker of a state's authority. Frontier regions occur where boundaries are very weakly developed. They involve zones of underdeveloped territoriality, areas that are distinctive for their marginality rather than for their belonging.

Frontier can be an area between two states where a precise boundary has never been defined such as most of the area between Saudi Arabia and Yemen. It is a border zone, unclaimed, unsettled and unused, in to which peoples from each side way at times intrude but over which neither sides claims or exercises an exclusive control. It is outer oriented i.e. its main attention is directed towards the outlying areas. The frontier is a manifestation of centrifugal forces. At the local level many examples of frontier, or marginal, region exist. Although the residents of most towns and cities recognize a series of distinctive districts and neighbourhoods, these are often separated by zones or spaces that are marginal. Not fully integrated into the territorial realm of any one socio-cultural group, these spaces are often transitional in nature, with a relatively rapidly changing pattern of land use and an equally rapidly changing profile of residents.

**Boundaries: The Limits of the State**

Boundary is a finite and precise line surrounding and defining the territory of a state. In fact it is not a line but a plane, a vertical plane that cuts through the air space, the soil, and the sub soil of the adjacent states. It is inner oriented (i.e. created and maintained by the will of the central government. It is the outer limit within which a government exercises effective control. No portion of the earth's land surface is outside the claimed control of a national unit, that even uninhabited Antarctica has had territorial claims imposed upon it. Each of the world's states is separated from its neighbors by international boundaries, or lines that establish the limit of each state's jurisdiction and authority.

Boundaries indicate where the sovereignty of one state ends and that of another begins. Within its own bounded territory, a state administers laws, collects taxes, provides for defense, and performs other such governmental functions. Thus, the location of the boundary determines the kind of money people in a given area use, the legal code to which they are subject, the army they may be called upon to join, and the language and perhaps the religion children are taught in school. These examples suggest how boundaries serve as powerful factor of cultural variation over the earth's surface. Specifically boundaries have the following functions: It is important for defensive function

* Boundaries mark the limit of state jurisdiction
* In fact it is not a line but a plane, a vertical plane that cuts through the air space, the soil, and the sub soil of the adjacent states.
* It is inner oriented (i.e. created and maintained by the will of the central government. It is the outer limit within which a government exercises effective control.)
* Commercial function of boundary (the government can erect tariff walls against outside• competition for its market and thus assist international industries.
* Legal function- residents living within sight of the border may have closer linguistic,• historical and religious ties with the people, on the other side; they are subject to the regulations prevailing on their side of the boundary. Furthermore, the government usually attempts to control emigration and immigration at points along the borders.
* Serve as state symbols of sovereignty, and forester nationalism
* Needed for administrative purposes

**3.2.1 Types of Boundaries**

In the real world there are 3 main types of boundaries. These are natural, geometric and cultural boundaries.

1. **Natural (physical) boundaries** – are those boundaries based on recognizable physiographic features, such as mountains, rivers, and lakes. It is the most primitive and ancient boundaries. Although they might seem to be attractive as borders because they actually exist in the landscape and are visible dividing elements, many natural boundaries have proved to be unsatisfactory. That is, they do not effectively separate states.
2. **Mountains and hills**- boundaries drawn along mountains and hills, which seemedso• unambiguous when first delimited have, proved to be the source of bitter controversy. Example the boundary between china and India was designed to follow the line of Himalayas and other ranges but it is disputed. Many international boundaries lie along mountain ranges, for example in the Alps, Himalayas, and Andes, but while some have proved to be stable, others have not. Mountains are rarely total barriers to interaction. Although they do not invite movement, they are crossed by passes, roads, and tunnels. High 76 pastures may be used for seasonal grazing, and the mountain region may be the source of water for hydroelectric power. Nor is the definition of a boundary along a mountain range a simple matter. Should it follow the crests of the mountains or the water divide(the line dividing two drainage areas)? The two are not always the same. Border disputes between China and India are in part the result of the failure of mountain crests and headwaters of major streams to coincide.
3. **Rivers, canals and lakes-** have the advantage of being more clearly marked on maps and more narrowly defined on the land than mountains and hills. The decision to locate boundary along the water course itself raises problems. These often two kinds. A) The position of the boundary, which is a line, in relation to river itself, which has width. B) The natural changes which occur in the bed of the river. It is quite inadequate to specify in the delimitation clauses of a treaty that the boundary shall follow the river. Rivers can be even less satisfactory as boundaries. In contrast to mountains, rivers foster interaction. River valleys are likely to be agriculturally or industrially productive and to be densely populated. For example, for hundreds of miles the Rhine River serves as an international boundary in Western Europe. It is also a primary traffic route lined by chemical plants, factories, blast furnaces, and power stations and dotted by the castles and cathedrals that make it one of Europe's major tourist attractions. It is more a common intensively used resource than a barrier in the lives of the nations it borders. With any river, it is not precisely clear where the boundary line should lie: along the right or left bank, along the center of the river, or perhaps along the middle of the navigable channel? Soviet insistence that its sovereignty extended to the Manchurian (Dongbei) bank of the Amur and Ussuri rivers was a long-standing matter of dispute and border conflict between the USSR and the People's Republic of China, only resolved with Russian agreement in 1987 that the frontier should pass along the main channel of the rivers. Any decision about a river boundary tends to complicate the use of the waterway by people of the states involved. Even an agreement in accordance with international custom- that the boundary be drawn along the main channel- may be impermanent if or when the river changes its course, floods, or dries up.
4. **Forest, swamps and deserts**- these features of the earth‘s surface have in common only• their irregular extent and their scanty population. When peoples penetrated slowly from each other it can create dispute.
5. **Geometric boundaries** – are the lines of latitude and longitude. These are easy to define on paper and their demarcation in the field, with modern methods of surveying, presents no problems. But the use of geometric lines implies, in general, an ignorance of the nature of the terrain. Their use shows a total lack of concern for such people as may live in the area to be divided, and in some instances they have, in fact, cut across total territories. Such boundaries are politically successful only when they are antecedents to settlement, if not also entirely pioneer. Example, most of the western USA is created by geometric boundaries. Frequently delimited as segments of parallels of latitude or meridians of longitude, they are found chiefly in Africa, Asia, and the Americas. The western portion of the United States Canada border, which follows the 49th parallel, is an example of a geometric boundary. Many such boundaries were established when the areas in question were colonies, the land was only sparsely settled, and detailed geographic knowledge of the frontier region was lacking.
6. **Cultural boundaries** – it is based on language, religion social barriers. These boundaries usually involve wars, disputes and constant changes. Example north Ireland and Ireland republic, India and Pakistan, Israel and Palestine

Other classifications have been devised that can be quite useful in analyzing boundaries and boundary problems.

1. **Functional classification**- for what purpose the boundary is designed. It might reflect whether the boundary was originally (primarily) for defensive purposes, as a separator of cultures, administrative purpose, or ideological bases(communist or non-communist areas)

2. **Genetic classification**- it is based on when the boundary was laid out; the origin is related to the development of the societies, which they separate.

* Antecedent boundary- it is boundary drawn before an area is well populated and prior to• the cultural landscape features. Example, the western portion of the United States-Canada 78 boundary is such an antecedent line, established by a treaty between the United States and Great Britain in 1846.
* **Subsequent boundary**- a border drawn to accommodate existing cultural differences.• Example the boundary between Pakistan and India, Northern Ireland and Ireland republic.
* **Superimposed-** is a boundary imposed on an area by a conquering or colonizing power that• is unconcerned about the preexisting cultural patterns. Example-the colonial powers in 19thcentury Africa superimposed boundaries upon established African cultures without regard to the tradition, language, religion, or tribal affiliation of those whom they divided. Other examples are Indonesia and Papua New Guinea.
* **Relict boundaries**- is a former boundary line that once had meaning but no longer function• as such, usually marked by landscape features. Example North and South Vietnam. The abandoned castles dotting the former frontier zone between Wales and England are examples of a relict boundary. They are also evidence of the disputes that sometimes attend the process of boundary making.
* **Legal classification**- could consider those boundaries that are settled and recognized in the• international law; those recognized only by the adjacent and some others. Although all of those concepts are useful for analyzing and understanding boundaries no type of boundary is necessarily better.

**Stages in the Development of Boundaries**

There are four distinct stages in boundary line development, but any individual boundary need not have proceeded through all three stages, and decades or even centuries can elapse between the stages.

**1st stage (definition of the boundary**) - involves the description of the boundary and the terrain through which it runs. This description identified as exactly as, the location of the boundary being established. It is formalized in treaties. Boundary definition is a general agreement between two states about the allocation of territory, a verbal description of the boundary and the area through which it passes.

**2nd stage (delimitation**)- it is when the treaty makers have completed their definition of the boundary and using large scale maps and air photographs, plot the boundary as exactly as possible. It involves the selection of a specific boundary site. The retention of the arbitrary straight lines occurred when one or more of the following conditions applied.

1. Straight lines were preserved if the borders lacked any economic and if the surveying of the boundary would have been unnecessary and unjustifiable expense.

2. Straight lines persisted if the borders lacked when the two countries concerned were unable to agree on any alternation. Example Angola and Namibia. It was usual for straight lines to be maintained when the same colonial power came in to possession of the separated territories. Example, Egypt and Sudan, Kenya and Tanzania by British, Botswana and Namibia.

**3rd stage (demarcation**) – it is the task of making the boundaries on the ground. When the boundary is demarcated variety of method is employed. Example, a mere line poles or stones may suffice. It involves the identification of a delimited line in the field, the construction of monuments or other visible features to make the line and making the boundary on the ground. Often demarcation does not follow promptly after delimitation; in fact there are many boundaries which have never been demarcated. The markers may be intermittent, like poles or pillars, or be continuous fences or walls. Most international boundaries are not demarcated-for example, that between the United States and Canada for most of its length. The "Iron Curtain" formerly separating Soviet-dominated Eastern Europe from West Germany and Austria, in contrast, was marked along much of its length by fences, watch towers, and mine fields.

**4th stage (administration)** - it is establishing some regular procedure for maintaining the boundary, settling minor local disputes over the boundary. Or, it relate to the provisions for supervising the maintenance of the boundary.

**Criteria of Boundary Development**

Political geographers have searched for the ideal criteria for boundary definition in hope of reducing international tensions created by boundary disputes. Some of the proposed criteria are: 1. Ethnic – some political geographers have felt that ethnic criteria may be the most appropriate for the definition of international boundaries. In other word, boundaries should be drawn so as to separate peoples who are culturally uniform so that a minimum of stress will be placed on them. Example, the states of India, Pakistan and Burma were established on the bases that may loosely be called ethnic. However it is difficult to completely or exactly separate people of the different character because the world population is too heterogeneous and inter digitated.

2. Language- it might also be proposed as a basis for boundary definition. But map of the world‘s languages shows patchwork of great complexity that would immeasurably compound the boundary framework existing today. Many states are a multilingual and would be fragmented in such effort. In this case then a boundary will inevitably a barrier between adjacent states. If a boundary separates which speak different languages, they are not likely to understand each other well, and with the result that relations may remain hostile across their international boundary.

3. Religion – peoples of varied races and languages have accepted the same faith, and people speaking the same language have adopted different religions. Nevertheless, in areas where religion has been strong sourced of internal friction, it has been a major basis for boundary definition. A good example is the portion of the Indian sub-continent it to (mainly Hindu) India and (mainly Muslim) Pakistan.

4. Physical features- many political boundaries of the world lie along prominent physical features in the landscape. Such boundaries have become known as physiographic political boundaries. I.e. it refers to any prominent physical feature paralleled by a political boundary; a river, mountain range, or escarpment. These would seem to be especially acceptable criteria, since pronounced physical features often also separate culturally different areas.

**Boundary Disputes**

Bounding of state with finite lines often leads to dispute over the location of the boundary. Disagreements of this kind between states can range from purely technical differences over the precise alignment of the boundary, sometimes even with in a greed delimitation, properly called a boundary dispute, to claims over pieces of territory, large or small, properly called territorial disputes. There is no clear cut definition of the point at which boundary dispute becomes territorial dispute, i.e. how much ground is involved to warrant calling a dispute territorial rather than boundary. Boundaries create many possibilities and provocations for conflict. Since World War II, almost half of the world's sovereign states have been involved in border disputes with neighboring countries. Just like householders, states are far more likely to have disputes with their neighbors than with more distant parties. It follows that the more neighbors a state has, the greater the likelihood of conflict.

**Types of boundary disputes**

Although the causes of boundary disputes and open conflict are many and varied, they can reasonably be placed into four categories. 1. Territorial boundary dispute- it refers to claims over pieces of territory, large or small; and these results from some quality of the neighboring borderland, which makes it attractive.

**1. Territorial Disputes:** Territorial disputes over the ownership of a region often, though not always, arise when a boundary that has been superimposed on the landscape divides an ethnically homogeneous population. Each of the two states then has some justification for claiming the territory inhabited by the ethnic group in question. The Balkan countries of Eastern Europe offer numerous examples of such territorial disputes. Regional tensions provided the sparks that helped ignite both World Wars, and the area is far from stable today. Ethnic minority problems fueled by historic enmities affect all the Balkan countries. Even land that might seem to be without value can become the subject of a territorial conflict. Since the early 1970s, thousands of people have been killed in a series of battles between Chad and Libya over ownership of an Aozou Strip, a 100,000 square kilometer (36,000 sq. mi.) piece of desert. The boundary between what is now Libya and Chad was originally set by France and Britain in 1899. In 1935, at the request of Italy, which had seized Libya, France agreed to move the boundary 100 kilometers (60 miles) south. Italy did not ratify the agreement, however, and Chad gained its independence with the original boundary intact. Libya disagrees, claiming the strip belongs to it.

**2. Positional boundary dispute**- it is a type of boundary dispute concerns the actual location of the boundary and usually involves controversy over the interpretation of terms used in defining the boundary at the stage of delimitation, or demarcation. For example, where does the line actually lay in a wide river chosen a boundary? Many such disputes have arisen because of ambiguous or vague identification in early treaties of terrain features chosen as the location of the boundary. The vague pre 1993 boundary delimitation between Iraq and Kuwaitis a classic example. Other example, the boundary between Argentina and Chile, originally defined during Spanish colonial rule, was to follow the highest peaks of the southern Andes and the watershed divides between east-and west-flowing rivers. Because the terrain had not been adequately explored, it wasn't apparent that the two do not always coincide. In some places, the water divide is many miles east of the highest peaks, leaving a long, narrow area of several hundred square miles in dispute. During the late 1970s, Argentina and Chile nearly went to war over the disputed territory, whose significance had been increased by the discovery of oil and natural gas deposits. 85 On the other hand positional boundary dispute often originate in political differences such as historical claims on lost lands or irredentist policies promoting union of ethnic groups separated by a boundary. Disputes over the sovereignty of islands are also example of territorial disputes.

**3. Functional boundary dispute** – arise when neighbouring states disagree over policies to be applied along a boundary. Such policies may concern immigration, the movement of traditionally nomadic groups, customs regulations, or land use. U.S. relations with Mexico, for example, have been affected by the increasing number of illegal aliens entering the United States from Mexico. In Central America, relations between Honduras and El Salvador, two countries that have long disputed their common boundary, worsened in the late 1970s, when Honduras expelled Salvadoran farmers who had illegally occupied available agricultural land in western Honduras.

4. **Dispute over resource development-** it concerns the use of some trans-boundary resources such as a river or coalfield. Neighbouring states are likely to covet the resources -whether they are valuable mineral deposits, fertile farmland, or rich fishing grounds-lying in border areas and to disagree over their use. In recent years, the United States has been involved in disputes with both of its immediate neighbors, Mexico and Canada, over the shared resources of the Colorado River and Gulf of Mexico in the south and the Georges Bank fishing grounds in the northeast. As another example, for over 35 years India and Bangladesh have disputed the shared water resources of the Ganges and Brahmaputra rivers, two of the world's largest waterways. They have been unable to agree on a long-term water management plan that would permit irrigation of more of the arable land in the river valleys, improve flood control, help stem deforestation, and allow development of the basin's hydroelectric potential.

**Chapter 4 Core Areas and Capitals**

A simplified view of economic space that assumes places can be categorized as belonging to an economic core (i.e., wealthy and possessing the means of production) or an economic periphery (i.e., poor and dependent on the core for the means to produce). The model is based on the observation of sharp economic development contrasts within and between nearly all territorial divisions. The core–periphery distinction can be found at any scale, from the local to the global.

The specific characteristics of the core are vague but are generally thought to include the concentration of power, financial capital, human capital, research, innovation, diversified employment, and steady economic growth. Conversely, the periphery is characterized by low wages, low levels of diversification, volatile economic conditions, low levels of education, and little investment.

This method of classifying places is particularly useful to Marxist economists because it emphasizes the necessity of uneven development in market economies. The uneven development described by the core–periphery model springs from the Marxist assertion that the accumulation of wealth in the core is a product of the exploitation of resources obtained from the periphery. In addition, core systems construct patterns of trade that force the continued dependence of the periphery on the core. These patterns of uneven trade, wage minimization, multinational corporate

structure, and migration encourage the departure of capital (both human and financial) from the periphery, thereby preventing less developed regions from altering their dependent status.

Although the core–periphery model is one of the most widely accepted conceptions in economic geography, it has faced criticism based on its simplistic reliance on trade as a causal mechanism and the vague Core–Periphery Models treatment of power relations in the model. The pervasiveness of this core–periphery relationship is also a matter of considerable debate. Adherents of dependency theory consider the core–periphery relationship to be a necessary element of capitalism and thus a perpetual condition in market economies. Adherents to equilibrium economics assert that the reduced cost of operating in the periphery will encourage a diffusion of economic activity toward these areas, thereby ending uneven development. Much of the current research in economic geography is focused on either identifying the mechanisms that create and maintain the core– periphery dichotomy or on investigating the merits of the dependency and diffusionist arguments.

**4.2 Types and functions of core Capitals**

Types Capitals

Capitals can view from the point of view of their position with reference to the state territory. These

1. **Permanent capitals**- it might also be called historic capitals. They have functioned as the leading economic and cultural center for their state over a period of several centuries. Example Athens, London, Rome, and Paris
2. **Introduced capitals**- Tokyo, in fact, was introduced to become the focal point of Japan when the revolutionary event referred to as the Meiji Restoration occurred. Recent history has seen similar choices made in other countries, but while Tokyo (then called Edo or Eastern City) was already substantial urban centre, other capitals were created, literally, from scratch. They replaced other capitals in order to perform new functions, functions perhaps in addition to those normally expected of the seat of government. Introduced capitals have also come about by less lofty action. Intense interstate rivalries among Australia's individual states made it impossible to select one of that country's several large cities as the permanent national capital, and a compromise had to be reached. That compromise was the new capital of Canberra, built in federal territory carved out of the State of New South Wales. Despite the general absence of planning for a time when the colonial city in Africa would serve as a national capital, the vast majority of former colonial States have retained the former European headquarters as the national capital.
3. **Divided capitals** – In certain States the functions of governments are not concentrated in one city, but divided among two or even more. Such a situation suggests- often reflectscompromise rather than convenience. In the Netherlands (a kingdom) the parliament sits in The Hague (the legislative capital), but the royal palace is in Amsterdam (the "official"capital). In Bolivia the intense rivalry between the cities of La Paz and Sucre produced the arrangements existing today whereby the two cities share the functions of government. In South Africa, following the war between Boer and Briton, a union was established in which the Boer capital, Pretoria, retained the administrative functions, while the British headquarters, Cape Town, became the legislative headquarters. As a further compromise, the judiciary functions in Bloemfontein, capita of one the old Boer republics that fought in the Boer War. The reason appears to satisfy the desire of both Africans-and English-speaking South Africans. Cape Town is the largest English-speaking city in the Union; Bloemfontein and Pretoria are the chief cities, respectively, of the Afrikaans-speaking Orange Free State and Transvaal.

**Chapter 5: Resource and Power**

5.1 Resource and definition and types

In common parlance, a resource refers to a supply of any living being, inanimate material, service, or information that can be used for a desired outcome. In geography, the term typically refers to a natural resource, any nonhuman resource derived from the earth, including its land, water, and air. Resources do not exist outside of human valuation or use. For example, coal has existed in the earth for millions of years but was not considered a resource until the Industrial Revolution. Resources frequently are divided into two categories: non-renewable and renewable. Non-renewable resources, such as fossil fuels, minerals, and biodiversity, are those for which there is a finite exhaustible supply on human time scales. Renewable resources are those that have the potential to be replenished. Most renewable resources, such as fisheries and groundwater, can be depleted if the rate of use is greater than the rate of replacement. A special class of renewable resources, perpetual resources, is inexhaustible on human time scales; sunlight is a good example. Warnings about exhaustion of natural resources have long provoked arguments about resource scarcity and sustainability. Thomas Malthus warned in 1798 that population growth inevitably surpasses food supplies. Paul Ehrlich argued in 1968 that population growth soon would outstrip natural resource availability. Others, such as Julian Simon, have argued that technology and human ingenuity always will find new resources to substitute for old ones. Resource use is sustainable if current use levels do not diminish the potential for future use. Thus, only renewable resources can truly be used sustainably, and only when the rate of harvest is less than or equal to the rate of replenishment. Of greater concern than the sustainable use of any particular resource is whether development as a whole is environmentally sustainable. This condition might involve substituting some resources for others, but in a way that keeps intact ecosystem services necessary to maintain human livelihoods into the indefinite future. Environmental sustainability requires not only the continued availability of renewable resources but also adequate sinks for pollution produced by using those resources.

Concern about sustainability and resource depletion has led to the study of natural resource management, conservation, and preservation. Preservationist views call for limited or no use of certain natural resources, whereas conservationist or utilitarian views suggest that resources should be protected for use that results in the maximum good for the largest number of people. One important factor in determining sustainability is valuation—whether resources are priced or valued to reflect ecological services and intangible qualities such as the beauty of wilderness.

Types of Resource

1. **Food resources:** An adequate supply of foodstuffs is a condition of human welfare, and its assurance is necessarily a primary preoccupation of a government. If food supply is not assured in time of peace, it certainly would be precarious in wartime, when movement and transportation that are usually more restricted and the labour force available to produce it is reduced.

No great power is completely self-sufficient in respect to foodstuffs, because in no instance is the area large enough the embrace the variety of environment necessary to produce the range of food now thought desirable. E.g. USA and France perhaps come closest to being self-sufficient. But none is able to produce foodstuffs of equatorial origin without extreme difficulty and high cost. E.g. sugar cane. By contrast such countries as the UK, Belgium, Switzerland, F.R Germany, and Sweden are very much more dependent on imported foodstuffs. Under normal condition the UK imports about half the total food consumption required of its population.

1. **Mineral resources**

The cultivation of many, perhaps most crops is a matter of cost and price. The climate, of course, sets limitations, but even these can in extreme cases be overcome- at a price. This is not so of Minerals. No price can coax petroleum or copper from rocks in which these minerals do not exist.

The extraction of minerals is thus more narrowly localized than the production of crops. Mineral resources are distributed much less regularly than cultivable soil. Not a single developed state is self-sufficient. Under normal conditions there is, then, a large trade in minerals- both mineral fuels and the minerals from which metals are obtained.

The situation concerning mineral resources differs, however, in two major respects  
from those concerning food resources. In the first place, the soil, given careful  
management, will go on producing without significant variation. Mineral resources,  
on the other hand, are exhaustible, every known deposit, if worked continuously, will  
run out. Second, food resources are perishable. Most minerals on the other hand, can  
be stockpiled, and the majorities do not deteriorate if left exposed to the weather.

1. **Fuel resources**

Coal of all kinds, as well as petroleum and natural gas- are more widely distributed than most  
metallic minerals. But not all states of the world possess it. Such an imbalance necessarily produces  
grave problems for the states lacking sources of mineral fuels. It may lead to the development of  
alternative sources of fuel, usually at much higher cost, or to the import of fuel and thus to a high dependence on the other countries for an essential raw material. States with Reliable domestic supply of coal are – USA, Russia, UK, Germany and Poland. At the opposite extreme are the Scandinavian countries and Finland, the Republic of Ireland, the Middle East and much of Latin America and Africa where there are few significant coal reserves. Between  
the extremes are countries, such as France, which are short of specific types of coal. Over all  
dependence on solid fuel is diminishing and this in turn increases the degree of dependence on other sources of power, primarily fuel oil, which are even more narrowly localized. In many areas HEP is also vigorously developed as an alternative to solid fuel, E.g. Switzerland, Austria, Italy, France and Scandinavian countries. The Middle East, Russia, Venezuela, USA are the major oil producers. It is mainly the Middle East, which has the largest proven oil resources. Because petroleum is necessary for industry and transportation, a steady and constant supply is a prerequisite of power. It is natural that any state would use its power to secure the continued supply of so necessary a determinant of power. Atomic power may be the industrial power of the future, but it is limited mainly to the technologically advanced countries. But its use is not so far as significant as that of petroleum.

1. **Strategic metals**

Second in importance only to strategic fuels are strategic metals. The significance of steel and of a number of non-ferrous metals especially copper, aluminum, lead, zinc, tin, manganese, nickel, and a number of other necessary metals need no emphasis. They are even more necessary in time of war for the manufacture of large quantities of military equipment. It has commonly been held that the loss of control over any such materials in war- time was a matter of very grave concern. A balance sheet of mineral resources is thought by some to be a key in power politics.

1. **Metalliferous Resources**

Strategic metal were defined as those materials required for essential uses in a war emergency, the  
procurement of which in adequate quantities, quality and time is sufficiently uncertain for any  
reason to require prior provision for the supply there of. No country can possibly be self-sufficient  
in the range of minerals, though the Russia and the USA more nearly approach self-sufficiency than any others. Iron ore differs from non- ferrous metals in part of the much greater demand for it, in part also of its wider distribution and its greater range of grade and quality. Iron is a common element of the earth's crust. Every state contains iron, though in most the grade, that is, the percentage of metal in the ore is too low (30%) to have any commercial value. The effect of technological developments, however, is to increase the margin of exploitability. In order to avoid risk of losing imported minerals governments stock- pile mineral or extract low-grade ores with higher costs.

1. **Manufacturing Industries**

A highly developed manufacturing industry is the most conspicuous determinant of power. Every great power of modern times has been an industrial power. No policy, however blustering and aggressive, is likely to be effective unless supported by the ability to manufacture the machines of war. The total productivity of a state rises with its mechanization, so that gross population totals cease to be any measure of relative productive power. Manufacturing industries give two power advantages to a state*:*

1. They are conducive to a higher standard of living. The total productivity of a highly mechanized people is, after making all allowances for the creation and maintenance of the machines, greater than that of a people not so equipped. Much of this surplus may, of course, be abstracted by the government and used to maintain large army or to invest in other countries or even in its own. But, if neither these happens the surplus will be distributed among those who help to create it. This distribution may be in the form of a shorter working week, higher incomes, insurance, pensions, welfare, or all of these. However, the surplus is distributed; it creates a higher living standard. The extent to which this living standard rises above a hypothetical minimum is the slack, or fat, which can be drawn upon an emergency.
2. The actual possession of the plant and equipment necessary to turn out the weapons and equipment of war. The most varied and developed range of industry; the less will be the degree  
   of dependence on other countries. It is not necessary that the industry should normally engaged  
   in making military items, though it is probable that their manufacture on a small scale would  
   continue, even under the most favorable international circumstances. What is important is that  
   the industry as a whole could be converted to the manufacture of such equipment at a short  
   notice. It can be assumed that industrial capacity is an important measure of political power; it should be possible to arrive at some method of ranking states on this base. Another measure of economic development of a state is the amount of power, which it consumes*.* There is a rough correlation between power consumption and GNP. Despite the extraordinary difficulties of arriving at a formula expressive of national power an attempt has been made to set a formula. Briefly it starts with the area of the state, correlated for population density and the closeness of the railroad net. It then adds a factor for population, correlated for technical efficiency, employment in industry, "moral", and the adequacy of the food supply. Allowance is made for the production of steel, solid and liquid fuels, and hydro-electric power; for the surplus and deficit in steel, petroleum, minerals, and engineering, for the size of armed forces and its possession of what is called euphemistically the nuclear deterrent. But all these need qualifications.
3. **Transportation**-The means of transporting people and equipment are necessary element of national power. Without them, raw materials cannot be assembled for manufacture, nor, when processed, can they be distributed to a market or consumer. There are two aspects of transportation:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *i)* | External-concerns access to foreign sources of materials; it involves the use of ships, ports, and canals, as well as the movement of goods across the land area of other states. Is concerned with the internal means of transportation within a state. |
| *ii)* |  |

A developed transport net, whether of road or rail is generally regarded as a prerequisite to national  
unity. Many states have a net of both roads and railroads radiating from the capital to all parts of the country, as in France, Great Britain and Russia. The role of railroads in giving a practical and  
functional unity to the state is supplemented by the role of roads and waterways. Roads are more  
flexible than railroads; they can negotiate steeper gradients, can be constructed more quickly and  
cheaply, and thus tend to be adapted where the volume of traffic would not justify, or the nature of the terrain would not permit, the building of railroads. Water transport is slow, relatively cheap, and admirably adapted to movement of bulk cargoes. It is feasible only where there are navigable rivers and canals, and this distribution is controlled by the features of the terrain and by the water supply. For rapid movement of large volumes of goods and numbers of people nothing can match the railroads. But at the same time they are particularly vulnerable

**5.2 The meaning and faces of power**

The term power refers to practices and processes through which institutions, groups, and individuals arrange the social world and attempt to change it to advance their interests. Traditionally, it has been political geographers who have been concerned with power and power relations. Political geographers have had a strong interest in the territorial aims of groups and nations and in the deployment of power to achieve those aims. Attention to state policies and actions have relied on conceptions of power as force that is gained and wielded by one group over another group. Studies of power within political geography have tended to be descriptive analyses of accumulation and trajectory of force. Cultural geographers tended not to incorporate power centrally in their scholarship because of the conceptualization of landscapes as organic expressions of cultural groups. Marxist geographers made important contributions to theorizations of power

by directly addressing structural processes shaping places. In general, however, there has been a pattern of geographers treating power as a realm of formal political institutions at the national and international scales and as separate from everyday life. More recently, scholars across several fields have been developing alternative theorizations of power that problematize traditional conceptualizations of power’s structure and its operational scales. Any one-sentence definition of power can be only a starting point for the understanding of a complex and multidimensional concept. Consequently, this discussion addresses three aspects of the term:

* 1. Power as force
  2. Power as a field of social practices, and
  3. The issue of scale in the operation of power

Traditionally, power has been equated with force and been framed as measurable and attributable to one or more groups. There are various types of force such Power as military, economic, and social. The analysis of power often has centred on the ability to project force or on the capacity to threaten force credibly. National governments gaining territory through military action are prime examples of power as force. There are two significant implications of the concept of power as

Force. The first is that power is seen as possessed or wielded by institutions. The second is that ascribing power to one social actor implies that other social actors lack power. The ability to use or project force is a stark element of contemporary social relations, as in the case of the ability of the United States to undertake military actions against other nations. Yet although force can be useful in social analysis, it can be understood as a limited perspective on power that ignores complex dynamics. More recently, geographers have drawn on alternative and more expansive theorizations that problematize the idea of power as a phenomenon that social actors possess. Rather than understanding power as something that is held by individuals or groups, power can be framed as a set of multiple processes in which social actors are located. Actors do not possess power rather, they align themselves in advantageous positions within dynamic processes of power. More expansive theorizations frame power as a multidimensional field in which actors of all types operate (e.g., governments, corporations, special interest groups, community groups, individuals). Actors, such as a mayor and a community organization, can be understood as positioned (either advantageously or disadvantageously) in a system of power. Systems of power have many dimensions such as corporate interests and neighbourhood organization agendas. There are also

Specific constituencies such as public school teachers and both the workers and management of important companies. There are also distinct geographic interests such as downtown businesses and suburban real estate developers. In a system or field of power relations, no one group has a monopoly on power over an extended period of time, and rarely is one group completely powerless.

Rather, groups maneuver in a social landscape where power is asserted and contested in numerous ways. Importantly, thinking of power as a process frames it as being produced by a wide range of actors, even those that are not explicitly political. In addition, understanding power as a field incorporates the ability to contest and resist as an important aspect of power. In the analysis of power, the processes can be just as important as, if not more important than, the end results of conflicts and struggles. The ability to project power is often contingent, finding expression and articulation only under specific circumstances. For example, a coalition of pro-growth urban interests groups may have success on a series of initiatives but also may have projects that fail to win acceptance. Similarly, a minority neighborhood may have a history of relative powerlessness in relation to a city government but may find success in stopping one particular project. Understanding power as a field of social relations frames it as structural yet dynamic and as both an outcome and a process. More expansive conceptualizations suggest that people and groups operate within a field of relations in which all groups and organizations have the ability to

Project and resist power in different ways. One aspect of power that has not been considered

Extensively is its operation across multiple scales. Individuals operate simultaneously in an array of power relations across many geographic locations and scales. For example, a married woman with children, a job, and an extensive social network may move among many positions of power. As a parent, she may exert extensive power over her children. She may, however, be in a subordinate position in relation to her husband. If the woman is a manager at her place of employment, she may be positioned advantageously in relation to the employees over whom she has authority, yet within the decision-making hierarchy of her firm she may be marginalized by gender ideologies that limit her opportunities for promotion. In each relation and in each location, power is part and parcel of the woman’s life. How different dimensions of power do and do not intersect at specific locations are significant questions that present rich opportunities for geographers to explore.

5.3 power-resource nexus
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